BEFORE NANCY KEENAN, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE OF MONTANA

IN THE MATTER OF TRANSFER)

OF TERRITORY OF HIGH SCHOOL) DECISION AND ORDER DISTRICT NO. 29,) SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA) OSPI 192-90

* * * * * * * * * * *

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Gordon and Jeanette French (Respondents), Plentywood, Montana, sought transfer of territory from Outlook High School District No. 29, Sheridan County, to Plentywood High School District No. 20, Sheridan County. Pursuant to state statute, a hearing was held before the Sheridan County Superintendent of Schools who granted the transfer on December 14, 1990.

Ken Hagan, individually, and as chairman of the Outlook Public Schools (Appellants), appealed the order of the County Superintendent to this Superintendent pursuant to Section 20-6-320(4), MCA.

The issues on appeal are:

- 1. Whether the Respondents were qualified under state statutes to file a petition for transfer of territory.
- 2. Whether the petition, as filed, was a valid petition as required by Section 20-6-320, MCA, therefore invoking the jurisdiction of the County Superintendent of Schools.
 - 3. Whether all statutory requirements were met.

STATE PUBLISHING CO

DECISION AND ORDER

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has jurisdiction of this appeal pursuant to Section 20-6-320(4), MCA. This Superintendent has considered the complete record in this matter. The decision of the County Superintendent is affected by clearly erroneous findings of fact and by errors of law. The statutory requirements were not met as to qualifications to petition, content of the petition, and certification of the petition. The decision of the County Superintendent is reversed.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The standard of review by the State Superintendent is set forth in ARM 10.6.125. This rule was modeled upon Section 2-4-704, MCA, and the Montana Supreme Court has interpreted the statute and the rule to mean that agency (County Superintendent) findings of fact are subject to a clearly erroneous standard of review and that conclusions of law are subject to an abuse of discretion standard of review. Harris v. Bauer, 230 Mont. 207, 749 P.2d 1068, at 1071, 45 St. Rptr. 147, at 151, (1988); City of Billings v. Billings Firefighters, 200 Mont. 421, at 430, 651 P.2d 627, at 632 (1982). Further, the petitioner for review bears the burden of showing that they have been prejudiced by a clearly erroneous ruling. Terry v. Board of Regents, 220 Mont. 214, at 217, 714 P.2d 151, at 153 (1986). Findings are binding on the court and not "clearly erroneous" if supported by "substantial credible evidence in the record." This has been

further clarified to mean that a finding is clearly erroneous if a "review of the record leaves the court with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." Wage Appeal v. Board of Personnel Appeals, 208 Mont. 33, 676 P.2d 194, at 198 (1984). A conclusion of law is controlling if it is neither arbitrary nor capricious. City of Billings, supra, 200 Mont. at 430.

Section 20-6-320, MCA, is a lengthy and somewhat confusing statute enumerating specific rights and mandating specific procedural steps that must be taken. It may be noted that the 52nd Legislature, in S.B. 395, has extensively amended this statute principally to clarify procedure. Notwithstanding the need for clarification in language, the statute as applicable in this matter is without discretionary language.

Content of the Petition.

Section 20-6-320, MCA, states the statutory requirements for petitions for transfers of territory from one high school district to another. It states:

- (2) The petition <u>must</u> be addressed to the county superintendent and <u>shall</u>:
- (a) describe the territory that is requested to be transferred and to what district it is to be transferred;
- (b) state the reasons why such transfer is requested; and
- (c) state the number of high-school-age children residing in such territory. [emphasis added]

A review of the record established with the County Superintendent clearly shows that the petition was incomplete.

DECISION & ORDER PAGE 3

1 Tl
2 We
3 Ce
4 5 Ce
6 I

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The hearing officer in fact found that the statutory requirements were <u>not</u> met. Finding of Fact No. 4.

Certification of the Petition.

Section 20-6-320, MCA, mandates that each petition be certified by a majority of the county's board of commissioners. It states in part:

- (3) On receipt of a valid petition for a territory transfer, the <u>county superintendent shall</u>:
- (a) present the petition to the board of county commissioners for certification that the criteria set forth in subsection (1) have been met.
- (b) <u>file the petition as certified by the board</u> <u>of county commissioners;</u> [emphasis added]

There is no evidence in the record that the required certification was sought or completed.

Qualifications to Petition.

Section 20-6-320, MCA, states the requirements and procedures for transferring territory from one high school district to another and states who may file a petition. It provides:

Transfer of territory from one high school district to another. (1) A majority of electors of any high school district who are qualified to vote under the provisions of 20-20-301 and who reside in territory that is part of a high school district may petition the county superintendent to transfer such territory to another high school district if:

. . . . [emphasis added]

Section 20-20-301, MCA, specifies the qualifications of an elector for school districts. It states in part:

24 25

DECISION & ORDER PAGE 4

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

An individual is entitled to vote at school elections if he has the qualifications set forth in 13-1-111 and he is a resident of the school district . . [emphasis added]

Section 13-1-111, MCA, states in part:

Qualifications of voter. (1) No person may be entitled to vote at elections unless he has the following qualifications:

- (a) He must be registered as required by law.
- [emphasis added]

Section 13-1-112, MCA, states in part:

Rules for determining residence. For registration or voting, the residence of any individual shall be determined by the following rules as far as they are applicable:

- (1) The residence of an individual is where his habitation is fixed and to which, whenever he is absent, he has the intention of returning.
- (4) An individual does not lose his residence if he goes into another state or district of this state for temporary purposes with the intention of returning unless he exercises the election franchise in the other state or district.
- (8) A change of residence can be made only by the act of removal joined with intent to remain in another place. [emphasis added]

Section 13-1-113, MCA, states:

Only one residence. There can only be one residence. [emphasis added]

A letter from Respondents to the Plentywood Board, states that the Respondents are residents of Plentywood and registered voters in School District No. 20 -- not School District No. 29. High School Exhibit No. 3. By their own admission, Respondents do not meet the statutory requirements and have no standing to file a petition.

DECISION & ORDER PAGE 5

Without a complete and valid petition filed by qualified electors, the County Superintendent was without jurisdiction to hear the matter of transfer of territory.

Advisable and in the Best Interests.

The County Superintendent found that "it is in the best interests of the petitioners to transfer the territory, however, not in the best interests of those in the remaining territory." Conclusion of Law No. 3.

The County Superintendent is required to hear residents or taxpayers of either affected district, and grant the petitioned request if found advisable and in the best interests of the residents of the territory. Section 20-6-320(4), MCA.

The Montana Supreme Court has interpreted the language in Section 20-6-213(4), MCA, pertaining to the transfer of territory in an elementary district. Gunderson v. Board of County Commissioners, 183 Mont. 317, 599 P.2d 359 (1979). The language of that statute is substantively the same as that in Section 20-6-320(4), MCA. The court in Gunderson found that the transfer petition could be granted only if the requested transfer is deemed both advisable and in the best interests of the residents of the territory in question. It further held that advisability pertained to the remaining territory and that having determined that a transfer was inadvisable for the remaining territory, the petition must be denied. The court said: "That there may have been persuasive and competent evidence that the transfer was in

DECISION & ORDER PAGE 6

the best interests of the residents of the territory to be 1 transferred is, as the law is written, superfluous." Gunderson, 2 183 Mont. at 321. 3 DATED this 20 day of May, 1991. 4 5 6 7 8 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 9 THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this 2/st day of May, 1991, a true and exact copy of the foregoing <u>Decision and Order</u> was mailed, postage prepaid, to the following: 10 11 Ken Hagan, Board Chairman Douglas B. Olson Outlook Public Schools 12 Attorney at Law Box 296 P.O. Box 1695 Outlook, MT 59252 Helena, MT 59624 13 Gordon & Jeanette French Robert E. Smith 14 229 S. Adams Sheridan County Superintendent Plentywood, MT 59254 15 County Courthouse Plentywood, MT 59254 16

Scott Campbell
Scott Campbell
Paralegal Assistant
Office of Public Instruction

DECISION & ORDER PAGE 7

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24